



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,677	12/27/1999	MARK D. SMITH	EN999071	9073
7590 04/05/2004		EXAMINER		
SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND P C			NGUYEN, CHAU T	
ATTORNEY AT LAW 314 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OWEGO, NY	<del></del>		2176 <b>10</b> DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u> </u>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	V
Advisory Action	09/472,677	SMITH, MARK D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
<u></u>	Chau Nguyen	2176	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 17 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica ) a timely filed amendment which	ition. A proper reply to a places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	. In
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a). The feet have been filed in the control of the	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extens originally set in the final Office action; of	ion
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF</li> </ol>			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	·	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying th	е
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendmen	t
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3-11</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) applied	roved or b) disapproved by t	ne Examiner.	
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer			
10. Other:	//	Taful	
		JOSEPH FEILD	
	SUPERVIS	SORY PATENT EXAMINER	



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner's maintained the final rejection over Jones et al., Junkin, and further in view of Kerry A. Lehto et al. (There are no amendments in the Response After Final as stated in page 11.)